

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 93 04:30:29 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #81
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 31 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 81

Today's Topics:

 2 meter phone calls? (2 msgs)
 Another 3rd Party Question (2 msgs)
 Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines (2 msgs)
 The next attack on hams (2 msgs)
 The no-code issue (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 16:15:36 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[This discussion belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]

In article <1993Mar30.154403.29055@cbnews1.cb.att.com> spf@cbnews1.cb.att.com
(Steve Frysinger of Blue Feather Farm) writes:

>I thought autopatch could only be used for emergency purposes (and not to
>avoid costs), when it is not possible to get to a pay phone. Judging by
>your comments above, it would be "legal" to autopatch home to tell my
>family I'm stuck in traffic and to start dinner without me. Is this
>correct?

Yes.

This is an outgrowth of the urban legend that it's not legal to use the

autopatch to avoid toll charges. Ever since I first heard this in 1977, I have never been able to find a regulation stating this, nor has anyone else ever been able to point one out to me. If you think about it, if it's not legal to use the autopatch for this purpose, then HF phone patches would not be legal either - and they have been going on for ages.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I can understand if it just won't work but I think locking up my system
to tell me this is a little excessive." -- Steve Luzynski

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 01:56:37 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

slp9m@cc.usu.edu (Scott E. Parker WA7VYJ) writes:
: In article <1993Mar30.161536.9803@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu
(Jay Maynard) writes:

: > [This discussion belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]

:

: It's not the law that prohibits using the patch to avoid toll charges but
: rather the telephone company tariffs. You won't go to jail but the phone
: company would be justified in getting bent out of shape and denying a line to
: the repeater. Now, if any telco anywhere has ever really done this, that's
: another question.

:

: 73, - SEP

:

Can you help me find references in the tariffs? I have never seen mention
of amateur phone-patches.

Our toll free dialing area is only twelve miles. Our repeater goes out at
least fifty miles. Most of our coverage is outside the local dialing area.

California tariffs now allow an amateur radio station to obtain
residential telephone service at commercial locations. A residential flat
rate line can be less expensive than a business line.

I think this interpretation of the rules came about in the early days of
repeater auto-patching, when interconnecting to the telephone network was
in its infancy. The phone companies thought that the amateur service might
compeat with them in offering third-party mobile service.

--

Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ w6pw.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 15:55:10 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar30.073714.23515@usl.edu> cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:

>

>How come since before W.W. 1, the United States has been great allies with
>both the French as well as the British, and there is NO 3rd party agreement?
[delete]

>What is the process? I speak with British hams all the time, whats to
>hurt if i send traffic to a friend in England, thats not a ham. Am i
>not supposed to reveal matters of military intelligence?

Charlie, the problem is not possible leakage of military secrets. The problem is that the phone companies of European nations are government owned and they are loath to forgo the revenue that they collect for international calls. It's really that simple, they don't want any non-governmental competition, however small, to their money machines. It's at the insistence of these government owned PTTs that most of the third party rules exist in amateur radio.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 17:46:38 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!gatech!mailer.cc.fsu.edu!geomag!zateslo@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar30.073714.23515@usl.edu> cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:

>How come since before W.W. 1, the United States has been great allies with
>both the French as well as the British, and there is NO 3rd party agreement?
>I mean, we are supposed to be the "best of buddies" right? You know, lots
>of trading, and tourism, and the such. What is the deal here? Is this some
>sort of governmental red tape or what?
> [...]
>What is the process? I speak with British hams all the time, whats to
>hurt if i send traffic to a friend in England, thats not a ham. Am i
>not supposed to reveal matters of military intelligence?
>

Charlie, the problem is not with the FCC, or with the amount of good will
we share with our friends across the sea. In almost every country
in Europe (and much of the rest of the world), all telecommunications
is controlled, and often operated, by the country's Post-Telegraph-
Telephone agency (PTT). The PTTs historically have forbidden
competition from private sources. Hams in just about all of
Europe are forbidden all third-party traffic, internal and
external. The FCC forbids third-party traffic with those
countries so that we devilish American hams won't try to tempt
some French ham into saying hi to Uncle Pierre for us. It is
dumb, considering what a non-threat ham traffic is, but the ban
is there.

Ted Zateslo, W1X0
zateslo@geomag.gly.fsu.edu

Date: 30 Mar 93 13:01:42 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:

|> goldstein,marvin (mgsail@prefect.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
|> : Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does
|> : it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
|> : airplane?
|> :
|> :
|> If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
|>

Pick up the Air-Phone and call them. The last plane I was on had a phone
in the armrest of every seat. :-)

bill KB3YV

--

```
Bill Gunshannon      | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco  
bill@cs.uofs.edu     | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."  
                     | #include <std disclaimer.h>
```

Date: 30 Mar 93 11:43:16 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article RJN41B2w165w@jackatak.raider.net, jackhill@jackatak.raider.net (Jack GF Hill) writes:

|
|What could possibly be *SO* important as to REQUIRE a response from
|30,000 feet, let alone the beep in the first place?

Have you seen "What about Bob?" You really should. ;^)

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

Old Sourdoughs never die. They just ferment away.

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 19:17:12 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The next attack on hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Mar25.194652.36389@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>
steven@ulysses.atmos.colostate.edu (Steven London) writes:
>The perceived risk of cancer from RF should be a very real source of concern
>for hams.
>
>When it comes to public hearings in front of /city/county/town boards, there
>are no nuts or fruitcakes. Politics is all that matters. The elected
>officials could care less about science, reasoning or the law. All that
>matters is what will play well next election day. I have often seen our
>local boards knowingly violate laws. They are betting that you do not have
>the money or guts to fight them in court. Even if you do fight them legally,
>it will be years before you can overturn their decisions. By then, the

>matter will long since be forgotten, and won't be an election day issue.
>Besides, your local elected official can always "blame it on the courts"
>when they are forced to let you transmit/put up your tower, etc.
>
>Remember, a public hearing is NOT a court-of-law. Nobody is under oath to
>speak the truth, or have facts to back up their claims. When hams talk
>about ANSI standards, FCC preemption or radio propagation, and the "nuts"
>talk about studies linking RF and cancer, or towers and property values,
>your elected officials are under no obligation to find out the "truth"
>independently. They can do as they damn well please.
>Unfortunately, I see dark days ahead for ham radio.
>Steve London,
>N2IC/0

Some generally true comments above, BUT part of why this happens is because people (hams included) pay little attention to what these elected officials (and appointed board members) do most of the time. That certainly doesn't change things as they are now, but unless people (hams) stay up on what their town's representatives are doing, especially in areas of building codes and zoning, then all too often it will be TOO LATE, and you'll be dealing with restrictive zoning rules after they have been passed, instead of influencing what they say while they are being proposed.

Another thing to keep in mind is that there can be unity in strength if folks with different interests support each other. For example: How supportive are you of someone who wants to work on their car in their driveway. If you stand idly by while the town fathers "outlaw" doing repairs on your own property (yes, it has happened) or "outlaw" parking a pick-up truck in the driveway, then why would you expect those people to support a ham's desire to have a 75 foot tower?

Just some things to think about next time you see the town fathers proposing some overly broad zoning restriction, even though you may think it doesn't affect your ham radio hobby.

Bill Sohl, K2UNK, Councilman Mount Olive Township, NJ

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 30 Mar 1993 22:49:11 GMT

From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!
umn.edu!lynx.unm.edu!dns1.NMSU.Edu!dns1.NMSU.Edu!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The next attack on hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

sohl,william h writes

: Some generally true comments above, BUT part of why this happens is
: because people (hams included) pay little attention to what these
: elected officials (and appointed board members) do most of the time.
: That certainly doesn't change things as they are now, but unless
: people (hams) stay up on what their town's representatives are
: doing, especially in areas of building codes and zoning, then all
: too often it will be TOO LATE, and you'll be dealing with restrictive
: zoning rules after they have been passed, instead of influencing
: what they say while they are being proposed.

:

: Another thing to keep in mind is that there can be unity in strength
: if folks with different interests support each other. For example:
: How supportive are you of someone who wants to work on their
: car in their driveway. If you stand idly by while the town fathers
: "outlaw" doing repairs on your own property (yes, it has happened)
: or "outlaw" parking a pick-up truck in the driveway, then why would
: you expect those people to support a ham's desire to have a 75 foot
: tower?

:

: Just some things to think about next time you see the town fathers
: proposing some overly broad zoning restriction, even though you may
: think it doesn't affect your ham radio hobby.

I'm a city planner, one of those evil nasty people that get cursed out on 2M
because of the strict antenna regulations imposed on amateur antennas. Whenever
I ask someone who's sounding off about how restrictive the city zoning is, I
tell them to quote the part of the zoning code that restricts ham antennas.
They can't. Our zoning code is relatively strict towards building height and
sign height, but as far as antennas goes, the only restrictions that apply is
that the elements can't project over your property line, the antenna and its
elements must be completely behind the front of the house and it must be able
to withstand a steady 75 MPH wind gust. Nothing about height, size, number of
elements or anything like that.

Most restrictins that I've seen placed on antennas are restrictive covenants
in new subdivisios. Those are not imposed by the city or a governmental body:
they are imposed by the developer of a subdivision, and a violation of a
restrictive covenant is a civil matter. Cities do not have the power to
enforce restrictive covenants. I've seen many zoning codes, and very few deal
with amateur antenna restrictions.

--

Dan Tasman N2UGY

dtasman@dante.nmsu.edu

"I think that I shall never see a billboard lovely as a tree
Indeed, unless the billboards fall, I'll never see a tree at all."
Ogden Nash

Date: 30 Mar 93 14:29:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>No-coders have to learn twice as much technical material, and there's
>no difference between the two except one doesn't transmit on code
>frequencies. And remember, the no-coder may know twice as much as you
>who think you are superior because you do know it.

JR --

it's not quite twice as much material. in fact, i'd like to see the next
edition of "Now You're Talking" drop the segregation of "Novice" and
"Technician" material. this would make the presentation smoother by just
proceeding along w/o regard to what material is on what test...or at least
change the flow so you don't have a chapter of Novice followed by a chapter of
Tech. i think it makes it harder to work with the book when it's broken up
that way.

the technician licensee has operating privileges on all amateur bands above 30
MHz (this includes those "code only" segments at 50-50.1 and 144-144.1 MHz).
he has all emission privileges of an Extra Class with the probable exception
of being able to operate from space w/o a waiver (or has that been changed?).

a novice licensee that upgrades to technician or a technician licensee that
earns ANY code credit has access to the 4 HF bands a Novice can use at the
same power restrictions a Novice has forever (although if it's 13 or 20 i'd
bet he's going to upgrade within the year..).

and finally...I don't think the evidence suggests that an amateur radio
license is an intelligence test. I would suggest that many extraordinarily-
bright people i have met that have amateur licenses tend to hold Advanced or
Extra just because it's a ladder to climb. (be interesting to see how
the astronauts are doing on upgrades - sample size wouldn't really be big
enough to make general conclusions, tho).

73, bill

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 14:46:57 GMT
From: destroyer!news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <93088.130556I010356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU>, I010356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU writes:

> No-coders have to learn twice as much technical material, and there's
> no difference between the two except one doesn't transmit on code
> frequencies. And remember, the no-coder may know twice as much as you
> who think you are superior because you do know it.
>
> JR

Not quite. It is legal to transmit code on ALL amateur frequencies. (It's not common on many.) So, technically, a no-code Tech can transmit code on any amateur frequency above 50 MHz, including that little slice of the 2 meter band (144.0-144.1 MHz ?) where only code is allowed.

In view of this, should we change the way we refer to this class of license differently? Maybe instead of no-code Techs we could call them the "coded-but-they-don't-have-to-prove-it Techs"? :) :) :) :)

(Please note the smilies!)

73 es cul, Will, NORDV/AA
no-longer a "coded-but-I-didn't-have-to-prove-it Tech", or even a
"coded-but-it's-not-on-my-license Tech", but now a
"I-finally-passed-the-13-wpm-code-and-bought-a-HF-rig Advanced"

--
Will Turner, NORDV/AA
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: 29 Mar 93 23:57:45 GMT
From: microsoft!wingnut!laurahal@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <228.368.uupcb@twwells.com> brian.berkes%pics@twwells.com (Brian Berkes) writes:

>Why does everybody WHINE WHINE WHINE about the code??? Just do it and
>quit WHINING! Don't be so lazy! Code separates the ham operators from
>the CBers! Cut the crap and just do it!

I'm certainly not whining - I'm writing the Basic exam this Thursday,
which in Canada gives me a no-code VHF-and-above license. I'll
become more familiar with operating procedures and such on 6 meters
and up, practice my morse code, and then pass my 12 wpm code test.
Just like how you got your drivers license: you got an introductory
restricted form, practiced, and then got the real thing.

Seems reasonable to me...

...laura

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 23:00:10 EST
From: noc.near.net!saturn.caps.maine.edu!maine.maine.edu!io10356@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>In article <93088.130556IO10356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU>, IO10356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU
>writes:

>> No-coders have to learn twice as much technical material, and there's
>> no difference between the two except one doesn't transmit on code
>> frequencies. And remember, the no-coder may know twice as much as you
>> who think you are superior because you do know it.

>>

>> JR

>

> [Various replies deleted]

OK, I knew that if I said something it would evoke criticism, so I
will try to clarify what I meant. The post was originally written be-
cause I, as well as many others I'm sure, are sick of hearing that
no-code technicians are going to ruin HAM radio for everyone forever.
I was not comparing the No-Code Technician License with the Code
Technician license as it would appear, but rather the No-Code Tech
with the Novice. I realize that the two provide different privileges,
but it is my opinion that taking the extra test involved in getting a
Technician Class license more than makes up for learning 5wpm CW. And
in so saying, the test of technical knowledge amounts to about twice
what you need to know to get a Novice license, notwithstanding that
you need to know Morse Code. I plan on taking the code test, but I
don't want the use of Morse Code to prevent me from being able to ac-
cess the wonderful world of HAM radio. If I have to settle for the

No-Code license, I will. I don't plan on spending the rest of my life as a No-Coder, I have more ambition than that. And please, no flames becuz I don't yet have my call letters. I will soon, believe me.

JR

Date: 30 Mar 1993 23:57:30 GMT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar25.213416.25117@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, <1993Mar29.132536.1@levy.fnal.gov>
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

levy@levy.fnal.gov (Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes:
>Flush the &^%*!@\$% beeper down the toilet.
>Come to think of it, that's not a bad idea at any time.

A couple of decades ago when I used to repair those damn beepers for a living, it wasn't a week that went by when we didn't get one that had fallen into the toilet and needed repairing. Some customers did it regularly.

Yeah, gloves and the dishwasher.
- Brian

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 23:21:11 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!servo.qualcomm.com!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, <1993Mar29.182402.13255@qualcomm.com>,
<1993Mar30.072440.23192@usl.edu>
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

In article <1993Mar30.072440.23192@usl.edu> cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:
>GEE, NO! GTE!

NO, I SAID GEE! I CAN'T (brap) YOU ON THIS AIRPHONE, ITS (wooosh) NOISY...
COULD YOU (pop crackle) LOUDER??

: -)

Phil

Date: 31 Mar 1993 00:01:03 GMT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar28.223950.29977@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<1p77vh\$1lu@network.ucsd.edu>, <1993Mar29.180403.29272@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Autopatch

jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>we _really_ need is a DSP chip that you could feed audio in one side and get
>repeat audio with a black hole for one particular frequency in it, and PL
>decode while we're at it.
>Too bad DSP requires an MSEE to do.

No, all it really takes is money and patience. The chips to do what you
want to do are made by MX-Com, among others, and do work, although
they're a bit fiesty to get running just right. And they're not cheap
in the ham world.

The App notes are quite good. Get them and drool.
- Brian

Date: 30 Mar 93 13:51:31 MDT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!slp9m@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <fritza.733424191@well.sf.ca.us>,
<1993Mar30.154403.29055@cbnews1.cb.att.com>,
<1993Mar30.161536.9803@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: 2 meter phone calls?

In article <1993Mar30.161536.9803@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu
(Jay Maynard) writes:
> [This discussion belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]
>
> In article <1993Mar30.154403.29055@cbnews1.cb.att.com> spf@cbnews1.cb.att.com
(Steve Frysinger of Blue Feather Farm) writes:
>>I thought autopatch could only be used for emergency purposes (and not to
>>avoid costs), when it is not possible to get to a pay phone. Judging by
>>your comments above, it would be "legal" to autopatch home to tell my
>>family I'm stuck in traffic and to start dinner without me. Is this
>>correct?
>

> Yes.
>
> This is an outgrowth of the urban legend that it's not legal to use the
> autopatch to avoid toll charges. Ever since I first heard this in 1977, I have
> never been able to find a regulation stating this, nor has anyone else ever
> been able to point one out to me. If you think about it, if it's not legal to
> use the autopatch for this purpose, then HF phone patches would not be legal
> either - and they have been going on for ages.

It's not the law that prohibits using the patch to avoid toll charges but rather the telephone company tariffs. You won't go to jail but the phone company would be justified in getting bent out of shape and denying a line to the repeater. Now, if any telco anywhere has ever really done this, that's another question.

73, - SEP

```
-----
                Scott E. Parker   WA7VYJ           \
Center for Atmospheric & Space Sciences           \|
                Utah State University              \|
                Logan, UT      84322-4405          \|
-----
```

```
INTERNET: SLP9M@cc.usu.edu
Twisted pair: (801) 750-2975
Home: (801) 753-3924
-----
```

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 07:05:19 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rouge!cfm1471@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar29.182402.13255@qualcomm.com>,
<1993Mar30.072440.23192@usl.edu>, <1993Mar30.232111.5163@qualcomm.com>7
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

In article <1993Mar30.232111.5163@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil Karn) writes:
>In article <1993Mar30.072440.23192@usl.edu> cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:
>>GEE, NO! GTE!
>
>NO, I SAID GEE! I CAN'T (brap) YOU ON THIS AIRPHONE, ITS (wooosh) NOISY...
>COULD YOU (pop crackle) LOUDER??
>
>:-)
>
>Phil
>
(BUZZ) hee hee hee!

Charlie

Date: Wed, 31 Mar 1993 07:08:53 GMT
From: usc!wupost!darwin.sura.net!rouge!cfm1471@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, <1993Mar29.132536.1@levy.fnal.gov>,
<1pampb\$c1@network.ucsd.edu>\$
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

In article <1pampb\$c1@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:
>levy@levy.fnal.gov (Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes:
>>Flush the &^%*!@\$% beeper down the toilet.
>>Come to think of it, that's not a bad idea at any time.
>
>A couple of decades ago when I used to repair those damn beepers for a
>living, it wasn't a week that went by when we didn't get one that had
>fallen into the toilet and needed repairing. Some customers did it
>regularly.
>
>Yeah, gloves and the dishwasher.
> - Brian

Bet that blue stuff really smelled! Guess the vibratin' ones are bad for
the sewer system too, eh? Call ROTO-ROUTER!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #81
